DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 439 SP 012 526

AUTHOR Tanner, Wendell R.
TITLE Developing and Implementing a Physical Fitness Program for Junior High School Utilizing a Peer-Tutoring Model.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 95p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Junior High Schools; *Models; *Physical Education; *Program Descriptions; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Tutorial Programs; Tutors

ABSTRACT

This project was designed to develop and implement a model for providing a physical education program for the students at Bacon County (Georgia) Junior High School utilizing the resources available. The concept was based on the results of effective programs employing peer tutors as instructors. A corollary goal was to provide positive experiences for both tutors and the tutees. An additional objective of the project was to provide a program that was equal to or superior to the traditional physical education program taught by a trained teacher on a full-time basis. Meeting state standards for accrediting criteria was mandatory. (Author/JMF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Kelley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED164439

Developing and Implementing a Physical Fitness Program for Junior High School Utilizing A Peer-Tutoring Model

by Wendell R. Tanner[1]

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders, Nova University

SP 012 526

Introductory Practicum
Douglas Cluster
Submitted: September 15, 1977

[1]Principal
Bacon County Junior High
Alma, Georgia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1
CHAPTER II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 3
CHAPTER III. STRATEGIES 6
CHAPTER IV. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9
CHAPTER V. OBJECTIVES 24
CHAPTER VI. PROCEDURES 27
CHAPTER VII. RESULTS 47
CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSION 60
APPENDIX A. AGREEMENTS 62
APPENDIX B. EVALUATION 69
BIBLIOGRAPHY 83

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The need for appropriate and well-supervised physical education, health, and recreation experiences as a necessary part of the school program is recognized by most people. For children to attain good health, physical fitness, and wholesome attitudes toward activity and leisure, it is necessary for them to have a well-planned, comprehensive instructional program. It is strongly urged that school officials make provisions for the inclusion of physical education, health, and recreation programs in their schools. These aspects of the total school program have great potential for the all round development of children.[1]

Life in our modern society of automation, advanced communication, and transportation requires relatively little physical effort. Because of this, there is an urgency to equip our youth with a high quality health, physical fitness, and recreation program in our schools.

[1]Paul DeLargy, A Physical Education Teaching Guide (Hinesville, Georgia: Liberty County Board of Education, 1971), p. 15.

This program must totally educate the individual and promote his development--physically, mentally, morally, emotionally, and socially. National and statewide emphasis on youth physical fitness stresses that the strength of our nation tomorrow depends in a large degree on the physical fitness of our youth today.

The school has a responsibility for providing instruction in physical activities so that each child may gain the skills, information, and appreciation which will enable him to meet his growth needs for activity, to profit from the social and emotional process involved, and to develop personal resources for wholesome recreation. It is a fallacy to assume that physical education values must wait until the secondary school to emerge. The basic skills, attitudes, appreciations, and knowledge must be taught on the elementary and junior high school level if children are to derive any appreciable benefit from subsequent programs.

CHAPTER TWO

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Recognizing the need for comprehensive physical education instruction in the public schools of the State, the Georgia Department of Education in consort with the legislature of the State of Georgia have taken steps to insure a quality program for the students of the State's schools by issuing specific directives. Georgia State Standards (1976), a set of criteria intended to improve the quality of educational institutions of the state, require that all students in grades one through eight (1-8) have a minimum of thirty (30) minutes of physical education each day. The Standards also require at least one carnegie unit in physical education be offered in high school (grades 9-12).[1]

In addition to state standards, physical education is regarded as an important factor in earning accreditation through the Georgia Accrediting Commission. The physical education program is expected to be organized and

[1]Georgia State Standards (Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Department of Education, 1976).

scheduled "as a discrete subject." In other words, the physical education program must not be a recess period, but a time for instruction through activities designed specifically to improve the physical fitness of the child. Because of the emphasis on physical fitness by these agencies, the future of physical education in the State of Georgia is insured, at least to a minimal degree.[2]

For many years, Bacon County Junior High in Alma, Georgia had an adequate physical education program. The school met all of the mandates of the state law and accrediting agencies. A full time instructor was employed which allowed scheduling of physical education classes throughout the school day. Even though many of the classes were larger than ideal (N=60-90), students still had an opportunity to participate in many of the activities offered. However, during the 1975-76 school year a crisis developed in the program.

The enrollment of Bacon County Junior High (approximately 535 in 1975-76) was projected to drop to 490 by the beginning of the 1976-77 school year. As a result of the smaller enrollment, the Superintendent of Schools in

[2]Georgia Accrediting Commission Bulletin (Springfield, Georgia: Georgia Accrediting Commission, 1976).

Bacon County decided that the teacher allotment must be reduced by one regular classroom teacher--from nineteen to eighteen. These teachers had to be utilized in the academic program in order to maintain State mandated class sizes of no more than thirty-five students per class. In addition, it was decided that a physical education instructor could be provided for one-half day or three junior high school class periods per day on reassignment from the Bacon County High School.

The problem that developed was: "How can a physical education program be organized for 490 junior high school students (grades 6-8) with the services of a half-time instructor?"

CHAPTER THREE

STRATEGIES

In order to provide at least a minimum program in physical education as prescribed by law, the principal of Bacon County Junior High School and the system superintendent began to consider alternative plans. The first plan considered was to allow the classroom teachers to conduct physical education classes for their homerooms. This would necessitate training sessions with the teachers and the development of handbooks of activities. The half-time instructor would serve as monitor and planner while on campus. He would also be able to assist teachers with their physical education classes on a rotating basis.

This plan was discarded for several reasons. First, the planning session for teachers would be virtually eliminated. Not only was this considered educationally unsound, it also was in conflict with requirements of the Georgia Accrediting Commission which suggests that each teacher have a daily plan period. This alternative

would also require an extensive inservice program and additional planning on the part of the teachers.

Another suggestion was to allow one of the academic teachers to work one-half day as an academic instructor and one-half day as a physical education instructor. This plan was dismissed as impractical since it would present serious scheduling problems.

Other physical education programs in the area were studied. Project Health and Optimum Physical Education based in Ocilla, Georgia was considered. This project is a nationally validated Title III demonstration project and has been considered quite successful. After reviewing the curriculum and the staffing patterns of this program, it was considered too expensive to maintain without outside funds. It would require a 1 to 30 teacher/pupil ratio. The focus of the program would be movement education rather than physical education. It was thought that a move from traditional physical education to movement education might be an acceptable goal but should be introduced gradually in the elementary program rather than at the junior high school.

The model on which this project was based was found in Ware County, Georgia, an adjoining county. Elementary schools in Ware County were served by peer-tutors from Ware County High School in their physical education programs. The high school students were transported to the elementary schools each day to work under the supervision of a certified physical education instructor. This approach provided a lower pupil/teacher ratio and allowed larger numbers of students to participate at a given period of time. Of necessity, more materials and equipment had to be purchased to instruct more students. However, this was less expensive than hiring additional staff. For the purposes of providing a physical fitness program at Bacon County Junior High for the 1976-77 school year, this model was adapted to the particular needs of a junior high school.

CHAPTER FOUR

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to review the published works related to peer-tutoring and physical education instruction, it was necessary to research three interrelated aspects of the total problem. First, the effectiveness of peer-tutoring as an instructional delivery method was studied. If the research showed peer-tutoring to be a weak delivery system, then the physical education program based upon peer instruction would not be effective. In other words, a model was not likely to be successful unless the premise upon which it was based showed promise.

Secondly, cross-age tutoring models were investigated. Since cross-age tutoring was the technique to be utilized in the delivery system, this area of research was of some importance. Lastly, the general study of physical education programs that represent unique departures from the established, traditional approach was essential.

Much has been written concerning peer-tutoring, cross-age tutoring, and instruction in the area of physical education. Since the reference materials were so vast, it was decided to limit the search to the last decade.

Peer-Tutoring

The concept that a student can learn better from reinforcement in addition to teacher-directed activities was established by writters such as Williams, Quilling, Fitz-Gibbon, and Mohan. These authors also verified that the use of less than fully certified individuals to teach has become common in many areas of the educational community.[1]

Many programs utilized adults in a teaching relationship

[1]Barbara Ivory Williams, "The Need to Study Multiple Skills," American Educational Research Association (April 1976): 1-30; Mary R. Quilling, "Controlled Experimentation in Research and Instructional Units," American Educational Research Association (February 1968): 1-9; Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon, The Role Change Intervention: An Experiment in Cross-Age Tutoring (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 129 949, 1970); Carol Taylor Fitz-Gibbon, "The Role Change Intervention: Experimental Data and Design for Compensatory Education," Central State Psychological Bulletin (March 1976): 14-27; Madan Mohan, Peer-Tutoring as a Technique for Teaching the Unmotivated (Fredonia, New York: Teacher Education Center, State University of New York, 1972): A Curriculum Guide for School and Community Services (Spring Valley, New York: Ramapo Central School District Number 2, 1973).

such as the one reported by Kilmer. Hedges and Majer cited studies in which college students were used effectively to teach children. The Oregan State Department of Education and the Canadian Education Association termed these teachers, paraprofessionals or teacher aides. Shreve called them tutors, and Svicarovich referred to them as volunteers. Regardless of the term used, the roles of the adults who assisted in instruction of children were most often the same.[2]

Still another resource that has been recognized in the public school community has been defined as peer-tutors. The peer-tutor is a school age student who teaches another school age student. For the purpose of this project, the study was primarily confined to peer-tutoring relationships.

[2]Joycelyn Kilmer, An Adventure in Enrichment (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 008 178, 1973); Larry V. Hedges and Kenneth Majer, A Longitudinal Comparative Study of a Process Oriented Tutorial Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 835, 1976): Manual for Developing a Senior Citizen Teacher Aide Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 139, 1975); Notes on the Use of Auxillary Personnel in Some Canadian School Systems (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 121 794, 1975); Barbara Shreve, The OASIS Peer Tutoring Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 178, 1976); John Svicarovich, Manual for Developing a Volunteer Tutoring Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 131 575, 1974).

In the tutoring relationship, age and familiarity with the tutor seemed to have little effect upon the learning that took place. Orost found that block counting and block sorting were mastered equally well by kindergarten and third grade students whether the examiner was older or of the same age and whether the examiner was acquainted with the student or unfamiliar to him.[4]

Successful learning through student-mediated instruction was studied by Rosenbaum. High school student instructors teaching high school students was cited by Werth. Fisherman and Dugan worked with junior high peer-tutors paired with elementary students while Deering reported on programs where upper elementary students taught lower elementary students.[5]

[4]Jean H. Orost, Effects of Age and Familiarity on Examiner on Test Performance: A Draft (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 069 689, 1972).

[5]Peter S. Rosenbaum, Peer-Mediated Instruction (New York: Teacher College Press, 1972); Trostel Gifford Werth, An Assessment of the Reciprocal Effect of High School Senior Low Achievers Tutoring Low Achieving Freshman in English Classes (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 033 956, 1968); Florence Fisherman and Marjorie Dugan, Alternative Programs and Services for the Non-Traditional Student (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 380, 1977); Albert Deering, Welcome to Tutoring Grades 3, 4, 5, 6 (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 029 841, 1972).

The peer-tutoring concept was employed with content subject matter as diverse as English, reading, art, science, social studies, and mathematics in works reported by Winifred Albizer-Melendez, Linda and Christopher Ramig, and the North Dakota State School of Science. Herbert Rosner cited studies that gave evidence of gains in reading achievement as high as a full year of growth in a ten week period of peer instruction. Joseph Collins and Michael Calevro conducted a study that demonstrated increases in mathematic achievement over a three month period of from 4.8 to 14.6 months gain per month of peer instruction.[6]

[6]Winifred Albizer-Melendez, A Comparative Analysis of Three Instructional Approaches to the Teaching of Reading (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 476, 1976); Linda and Christopher Ramig, Cross Age Tutoring: A Study of Achievement and Attitude at Grades Three and Five (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 124 928, 1976): The Learning Skills Center, Final Report: North Dakota State School of Science (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 317, 1974); Herbert Rosner, "Facets of a Cross-Age Tutorial Program" (Anaheim, California: International Reading Association Conference, May 1970); Joseph F. Collins and Michael J. Calevro, Mainstreaming Special Education Using a Peer Tutoring System and a Minimum Objective Curriculum for Eighth Grade Students (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 102 788, 1974).

Although age, familiarity, and subject matter did not seem to be key factors in successful peer tutoring models, there were two seemingly essential components--training and structure. Harrison found that results from post tests indicated that the effectiveness of trained student tutors were significantly greater than that of untrained tutors.[7]

Harrison and Cohen developed a four phased approach to training tutors. The steps were 1) identification of tutorial skills and formulation of tutoring techniques, 2) development of an instrument for measuring acquisition of tutorial skills, 3) specification of training procedures, and 4) implementing and validating the tutorial skill training procedures.[8]

In the peer teaching relationship, structure or program delivery models seemed to be invaluable to the success of

[7]Grant Von Harrison, Structured Tutoring (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 053 080, 1971).

[8]Grant Von Harrison and Arthur M. Cohen, Teaching Students to Tutors (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 011 142, 1967).

a peer model. Some programs effectively utilized programmed materials, computer-assisted instruction, or curriculum guides or handbooks. In each successful program, the tutor was closely supervised and directed by trained adults. These adults had to have training in diagnosis of educational problems, preparing and maintaining progress records, and the use of instructional materials and techniques.[9]

Dillner stated that historically most tutoring studies were concerned with the impact on the students being tutored. Recently, there was a tendency to look at the impact on the tutor and even to focus the program on that impact. A few recent studies were concerned with discovering ways to improve the program itself.[10]

[9]Grant Von Harrison, The Effects of Trained and Untrained Student Tutors on the Criterion Performance of Disadvantaged First Graders (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 031 449, 1969); Peter Rosenbaum, Peer-Mediated Instruction; Janet Roberts, Harrap's Handbook for Literacy Tutors (London: George G. Harrap and Company, Ltd., 1976); You're the Tutor (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 034 243, 1968).

[10]Martha Dillner, "Tutoring by Students: Who Benefits?" Research Bulletin vol 7 (Spring/Summer 1971): 1-35.

There seemed to be four key improvements that a peer-tutoring relationship sought to gain. They were 1) improvements in the attitude of the tutor, 2) gains in the measured achievement of the tutor, 3) increases in positive attitudes of the tutee, and 4) growth in the achievement of the tutee.[11]

The results of studies that were designed to measure the four "keys" were mixed. John Raushenbush reported a study that demonstrated significant gains in all four areas. William Halls and Pearl Brod, in separate studies, cited only partial success. In a few studies, such as those conducted by R. T. Patterson, Jr. and Barbara Diamond, no significant gains were found in any area.[12]

[11]William A. Deterline, Training and Management of Student Tutors (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 048 133, 1970).

[12]John Raushenbush, "The Student as Teacher," Independent School Bulletin vol 27 (December 1967): 35-6; William Halls, A Study of the Effects a Structured Tutorial Program Has on Reading Levels in the Sixth Grade (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 483, 1976); Pearl Brod, Effects of Tutoring on the Tutee in an Upward Bound Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 442, 1970); R. T. Patterson, Jr., Planning and Implementing a Peer-Tutoring Program to Individualize Instruction to Improve Reading Achievement (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 131 434, 1976); Barbara Diamond, Effects of Cross-Age Tutoring on Self Esteem and Reading Achievement (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 481, 1976).

Cross-Age Tutoring

There were a number of studies related to the establishment of programs that utilized cross-age tutors. Five representative programs were reviewed.

The Upward Bound Program had two main objectives. They were to improve academic achievement and to improve attitudes toward learning and higher education. College students tutored junior high school students in academic subject areas. As a result of this tutorial program, significant changes in educational motivation as well as attitudes toward school and aspirational levels were reported. Grades improved for half the tutees.[13]

Junior and senior high school students were used in the Malcolm X Elementary School, Washington, D.C., to tutor elementary students in mathematics and reading. This two year project was reported to be highly successful with gains being shown by the tutor as well as the tutee in both disciplines.[14]

[13] Pearl Brod, Effects of Tutoring on the Tutee in an Upward Bound Program.

[14] John Thomas, Junior-Senior High Tutor-Aide Program at Malcolm X Elementary School (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 128, 1976).

The Buddy-Tutor Project was a development of the Hilo Intermediate School in Honolulu, Hawaii. In this program, older students tutored younger students in reading and mathematics. The buddy-tutor kept in contact with the teachers and parents of the tutee. Through this process the buddy-tutor monitored educational and attitudinal changes. This made the tutor more aware of his own environment as well as that of the tutee. This project was considered as a promising approach to the reduction of juvenile deliquency by the Family Court Structure of Honolulu. The major drawback of this model was in securing cooperation from parents. The Buddy-Tutor Project was adopted from the Teen Tutorial Program of 1967.[15]

The Youth Tutoring Youth Program was developed to encourage positive attitudes in tutors toward going to school. An additional objective was to develop positive goals in career education and the helping professions. Underachieving, disadvantaged fourteen and fifteen year old Neighborhood

[15] Buddy-Tutor Project (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 126 208, 1974); The Honolulu Buddy System Project: Training, Evaluation, and Research (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 126 206, 1973).

Youth Corps enrollees served as tutors for elementary school children. The results of this project showed increases in acceptance and use of responsibility by the tutor. Increased learning by the tutor and tutee, advantageous rearrangement of vocational desires and increased pride in self were also results of the effort.[16]

The Junior Volunteer Program was a cooperative venture of the Banks Street College of Education and the Board of Education of the City of New York. The plan of action called for one tutor to be assigned to one tutee in a tutoring center with about ten other pairs. Close supervision was given by trained paraprofessionals. The purpose of these sessions was to improve the reading achievement of the tutor and tutee. Significant gains were shown in the reading achievement of both groups.[17]

Innovative Physical Education Programs

In colonial times, physical education was considered to be an individual matter with which the schools had no concern.

[16] Administrator's Memo: Youth Tutoring Youth (New York: National Commission on Resources for Youth Inc., 1968).

[17] Volunteers in Education (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Recruitment, Leadership and Training Institute, 1975).

As the need for voluntary activities grew, it became customary at the secondary level to introduce formal gymnastics that had been developed in European countries. Even though modifications were made, the system tended to be formalized and militaristic. It failed to develop individual skills or recreatory habits.[18]

Somewhat later, the plan of basing the system of physical education on sports was developed. It became the dominate note in the physical education program in American schools. The sports taught in classes of physical education many times had little carry over values for adult life.[19]

In some schools, progressive administrators introduced physical education programs based on individual needs and physical fitness rather than on sports. Many states now require a physical education program from kindergarten to the twelfth grade so that this area of the curriculum may receive the attention that it deserves.

[18]Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Logsdon, The Effective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 200.

[19]Ibid., p.205.

Goheen reported on three physical education programs which were conducted in order to determine the most appropriate delivery model to use. The models were skill oriented, play oriented, and free play oriented. The programs were evaluated on the basis of pre tests and post tests in physical fitness, motor ability, and social adjustment. Major conclusions were that the skill oriented group indicated significant improvement over the others. A more uniform improvement was shown in motor ability and performance in the skill oriented group. Both the skill oriented and free play groups were significantly more improved in motor ability than the play oriented group.[20]

In a study of structured physical education programs on the adolescent personality by Trimble, the results showed that achievement based on self competition was significantly better than competition between peers. The removal of external standards and the allowance for personal growth and achievement were recommended.[21]

[20] Royal L. Goheen, The Development and Evaluation of Three Types of Physical Education Programs for Educable Mentally Retarded Boys (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 012 141, 1967).

[21] W. E. Trimble, The Influence of a Structured Physical Education Program on Adolescent Personality (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 013 519, 1967).

In 1974, Ohio State University introduced the movement education program into the traditional physical education program. Individual needs were stressed. Competition was eliminated. Self-awareness became the core of the program. Intended for use at the pre-school and primary levels, the concept of movement education spread to upper grades. Numerous programs have evolved from this pioneer effort.[22]

A federally-funded ESEA Title III project designed to implement movement education in the schools in Georgia was Project HOPE (Health and Optimum Physical Education). This project was so successful that it has been validated nationally and has been adopted by schools throughout the country. The materials and equipment are inexpensive, but the low teacher-pupil ratio of 1:30 makes the program impractical for school systems which have limited funds for instructional personnel.[23]

[22] Physical Education for Tomorrow (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services ED 114 690, 1974).

[23] Project HOPE - Health and Optimum Physical Education (Ocilla, Georgia: Irwin County Schools, 1973).

The Cadet Program, a model utilizing cross-age peer tutors in physical education, was developed by the Ware County School System in Waycross, Georgia. High school seniors, who participated in the athletic program, were transported to neighboring elementary schools to work with students in physical education. Under the direction of a certified physical education instructor and in cooperation with the elementary teachers, a planned program for peer tutors was implemented. School officials and elementary principals have been quite pleased with the effort. They consider the approach as utilizing personnel and resources to the maximum degree possible.[24]

As a component of the review of the literature, a detailed analysis of the Standards and other accrediting criteria issued for the 1976-77 school year were made to insure that program changes were in accord with these guidelines. Ideas, concepts, and procedures that were obtained from the literature and programs reviewed were adapted to meet the needs of the Bacon County Junior High School Program.

[24]Interview with Donald Dial, Principal and DR. Terry Salanas, Director of Instruction, Ware County School System, Waycross, Georgia, November 1976.

CHAPTER FIVE

OBJECTIVES

In order to carry out this project, the following objectives were established:

1. As a result of this project, a physical fitness program for junior high school students utilizing peer-tutors under the direction of a certified physical education instructor will be developed, implemented, and evaluated by June 30, 1977 as evidenced by the school schedule and evaluation report

2. As a result of this project, all students (N=490) physically able (not medically excused) to participate in a physical fitness program will be placed with a peer-tutor under the direction of a certified physical education instructor by October 1, 1976 with student schedules and class rolls as evidence

3. As a result of this program, the peer-tutors (N=15 per quarter) will be able to follow

directions and instruct students (N=8) in physical fitness skills by the end of each school quarter with 80% accuracy as measured by the grades the student instructors receive in Physical Education given by the instructor (A=95, B=85, C=75)

Objective 3 was concerned with the impact of the program on the peer-tutors. From a group of advanced physical education students who were enrolled in advanced physical education training, fifteen volunteers per quarter were selected. These students had expressed an interest in working with younger students in the role of a peer-tutor. All of these peer-tutors were interested in the "helping professions," which included teaching. The need for following directions and being able to instruct were actually skills that were necessary for the success of the peer-tutor and the program as well. Following directions of a superior in order to be able to instruct was different from the ability to follow directions as a student in a physical education program. Following directions as related to teaching techniques, monitoring group activities, developing lesson plans (under supervision and in consort with others), and following directions as related to developing physical

fitness skills do not always mean the same thing. Even during the first months of the project, the fact that some of the volunteers (N=4), although skilled in physical education, were not able to follow directions was established.

4. As a result of this project, a model designed to utilize the resources of the system in a more cost effective manner to provide an adequate physical education program at the junior high school will be developed, implemented, and evaluated by June 30, 1977 as evidenced by the cost comparison section of the Administrator's Packet

5. As a result of this project, all students (N=490) participating in the physical fitness program will receive an equal or superior program by October 1, 1976 than was provided (October 1, 1975) as evidenced by the results of the evaluation checklist and the final report

CHAPTER SIX

PROCEDURES

After the determination was made that the physical education program at Bacon County Junior High School would be established utilizing the peer-tutoring model, the actual development and implementation procedures began. The program called for cooperation between two schools, Bacon County High School and Bacon County Junior High School. Therefore, coordination from the highest administrative level was essential.

Since this project represented a sharp departure from previous methods of instruction in Bacon County, it was necessary to proceed carefully in order to insure that implementation could be achieved as completely as possible. Planning and preparation were essential to prevent a chaotic situation.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the procedures undertaken in the development and implementation processes. A narrative of the successes achieved and the problems

encountered is given. Adjustments and changes that became necesssary are explained. To accomplish this goal, the chapter is arranged into four basic divisions: 1) preliminary actions taken, 2) provisions for the tutor, 3) provisions for the tutee, and 4) administrative and supervisory details. Evaluation of the project is explored in subsequent chapters.

Preliminary Actions Taken

Before students arrived at Bacon County Junior High to face peer tutors in physical education, much work and planning had to be completed, The decision to adapt the Cadet Model was finally made in early July of 1976. The preparations for implementation had to be made. Teachers were to arrive for pre-planning sessions the third week of August and students would arrive the last week of August.

The first step to accomplish successful implementation of the model was the securing of agreements between as many of the persons involved with the development of the program as possible. Written approval was secured from the local superintendent of schools and the curriculum director for the system. Written agreements were also

secured from the high school principal, the high school counselor, and the coach who would be assigned as instructor of physical education at the junior high school. The superintendent also gave written assurance that the project, if successful, would be submitted to the Board of Education for Bacon County to be included in the local curriculum of the system. This would serve as guidelines for conducting physical education classes in the system. Copies of these agreements have been placed in Appendix A of this report.

The next phase of development was the review of current information available, which could serve to form a foundation for the program. To accomplish this task, a ten year ERIC search was undertaken and Georgia State guidelines for physical education were studied. This involved securing curriculum guides for physical education from several States and school systems as well as studying the materials pretaining to peer-tutoring.[1]

[1]Basically, chapter four of this practicum report is a compilation of the result of this search. Copies of the guides and other information about the programs reported may be secured through the information cited in the footnotes provided.

At this point, area consultants and coordinators from two adjoining systems having exemplary physical education programs were contacted for input in the development of this project. These consultants included people with expertise in peer tutoring and physical education programs. The "new" information and guidance received from this source was of marginal value, since much of the preliminary work already done by the participant had drawn from the same field of reference and knowledge as the consultants.[2]

The consultant services did help to objectively review problems that arose and make suggestions for adjusting the program. Even though the work with the consultants continued throughout most of the school year, the vast majority of the preliminary actions taken were completed during the months of August and September.

Provision for the Tutor

The tutors for the project were selected from the students

[2]Since this document consititutes a doctoral level report to Nova University, words such as practicum and participant may be used. These words are particular reference words of Nova University and their meanings are easily understood in context.

at Bacon County High School. The school's campus was located approximately one mile from Bacon County Junior High. Transportation to the junior high was provided by the tutors themselves, since most of them had access to automobiles. The tutors who did not have cars pooled rides with those who had cars. It was possible for the coach assigned to the junior high school to have driven a school bus for the tutors, but they preferred to drive their own cars.

The Bacon County High School class schedule was well suited for a project of this nature. Bacon County in conjunction with other systems in the Okefenokee Co-operative Educational Services Agency area had implemented the BLOC quarter plan prior to the 1976-77 school year. The basic plan provides a 2½ hour block of time for instruction for one quarter (60 school days). This block of time, when completed, equaled one credit or carnegie unit.

Basically, the BLOC system provided two periods of two and one half hours (1 unit) and one period of one hour and fifteen minutes (½ unit) daily. Most of the students were scheduled for five one hour and fifteen minute sessions, but the tutors were scheduled for three one hour

and fifteen minute sessions and one two hour and thirty minute class for physical education.

Since the physical education period followed the lunch period of the tutors, it was possible for them to be on the campus of the junior high school fifteen minutes before the classes began. At the end of the third session, fifteen minutes remained in which the coach and tutors were not responsible for students. This allowed preparing of assignments and wrap up sessions between the instructor and the tutors. The instructor was also available after school hours to consult with any tutors who had problems to discuss.

It was determined that fifteen tutors per quater were adequate for the program. Credit was given in physical education to the tutors for successful completion of the quarter's work. Because of scheduling problems, the tutors were able to work only one quarter per year. However, eleventh grade tutors were eligible to re-apply for the same assignment for the following year.

Utilizing a list of volunteers for the peer tutoring program, the high school counselor and the instructor of

physical education assigned to the junior high school interviewed each potential tutor during the pre-planning week. The stated desire of the tutor to be in the "helping professions" was considered. High school records were reviewed in order to secure average or above average students, according to grades and mental ability assessments. Students with records of delinquency or disciplinary problems in school were eliminated.

The participant discussed the selections with the counselor and the instructor and concurred with the selections made. Out of the fifty-two volunteers, forty-five were chosen and scheduled into tutoring teams of fifteen tutors per quarter.

During the tutor selection stage of program development, the physical education instructor and the participant began developing a student manual for the tutors. The purpose of this manual was to serve as a training device and also as a curriculum guide for the tutors to use with the students of the junior high school. It was decided that the manual would be brief. Only the essential information would be provided. At the end of each quarter, the manual was reviewed and items that needed

to be revised or included in the manual were considered.

An outline of the final draft of the student manual contained six basic sections. Under each topic division, a brief description of the section was included.

OUTLINE OF THE STUDENT MANUAL

I. Introduction[3]

A brief explanation of the purpose of the program was given. A welcome to the tutor was made. The tutor was encouraged to discuss with the proper school officals problems which arose that might affect the project. The challenge was made to the tutor to make this assignment a growth experience, both for themsleves and the tutee with whom they would work.

II. Role of the Tutor

Following directions, providing leadership, instructing in the basic skills, accepting individual differences, demonstrating the ability to give oral directions, reacting calmly to student misbehavior and rebelliousness

[3]A copy of the Student Manual may be secured by writing and requesting the Student Manual from Wendell R. Tanner, Principal, Bacon County Junior High, Alma, Georgia, 31510.

were the basic descriptors used in explaining the job expectations of the tutors. Another major category was the seeking of help and accepting criticism and advice when appropriate.

III. Class Activities

The procedures for dividing the classes into groups were given. The "warm-up" period was explained, and the activities, which were included in the overall program were presented. A form was included for the tutor to indicate the types of activities with which he felt most competent in instruction (i.e., golf, volleyball, basketball, etc.). Rule books were referenced, and the tutors were advised to study these rule books carefully when they were distributed. The tutor was told that the instructor would be available to discuss the rules of the various activities.

IV. Grading Procedures

The statement was made that each student at the junior high school taking physical education would be graded by a "P" for pass or a "F" for failure. The decision concerning grading would be made jointly by the

instructor and the tutor. Consideration of participation, cooperation, and effort in activities would be made when grading. Skill or proficiency in sports would not be a consideration.

The tutors weretold that the grading procedures for them would be based upon skill in directing activities, interest in the tutee, the ability to instruct the basic skills, the ability to follow directions, and management techniques. In accord with the grade designations at Bacon County High School, the tutors were told that A, B, C, D, F would be the grades issued.

V. Discipline

It was strongly emphasized that disciplinary (punishment) actions would be administered by the instructor or principal only. The tutor was not to assign "running laps," suspending from the group, refusal to allow participation in an activity, or any other action assigned because of misconduct by the tutee. The instructor would be available for conferring relative to the problem and would decide if action was needed. He would make the disciplinary assignment or refer it to the principal.

VI. Lesson Plans

The procedures for the development of daily and weekly lesson plans were provided. The actual method of developing these plans is placed in this chapter under the section, "Provisions for the Tutee."

As a prelude to the implementation of the project, plans were made for the tutor who could not adjust to the demands of the tutoring role. As stated previously, the tutors had little experience in directing others and were limited in experiences in following the kinds of directions needed for the project. Some of the tutors could be arrogant with the students, "pushy or bossy" in assigning activities, or prejudiced toward certain groups and classes of students. The tutors were, after all, "the boy or girl next door," and not symbols of authority.

The decision was made that if such problems arose, the instuctor and the principal would confer with the tutor stating the problems and adjustment that had to be made. If the tutor felt that the adjustments could be made, the

opportunity to make adjustments was given, with re-assessment after five school days. If the tutor felt that the expectations were not possible or if the re-assessment did not show favorable improvement, the tutor would be reassigned to another role. There were needs for maintenance of the grounds and gymnasium, equipment storage and repair, class rolls to be kept, and receptionist duties in the office of the gymnasium. This assignment would not elicit a failing grade for the tutor, if the reassignment was accepted in a cooperative manner.

There might be tutors who could not accept any of the assignments. If this occurred, the tutor would be returned to the high school to complete the quarter in the traditional physical education class. The grades given to the tutor in this case would be given by the high school physical education instructor without consideration of the time missed or problems encountered before re-entry into the class.

After these plans were completed, the tutors were ready to be trained. The first day of school was spent in setting up schedules at both schools. Neither the tutor

nor the tutee were in physical education classes. The second day each quarter was set aside for training the tutors. The fifteen tutors for the quarter were trained using the Student Manual. The 2½ hour period was considered sufficient time to train. If additional time was needed for individual tutors, it was provided after school hours.

Junior high school students remained with the homeroom teacher during the training time. During this time the program or adjustments in the program were discussed. Suggestions for improvements in the program were elicited for the students, and discussion was encouraged relating to the value of physical education in academic subjects as well as other aspects of life. Approximately thirty minutes of this time was set aside for physical activities on the play ground. This activity was supervised by the homeroom teacher. This period of time was planning time for the teachers on all other days.

The agenda for the training session included:

12:35	Welcome
12:40	Review of Student Manual
1:15	Discussion of Student Manual
1:30	Tutor Selection of Activity Choices

1:45	Study of Rule Books and Discussion
2:30	Assignment of Activity Responsibilities
3:00	Wrap Up
3:05	Dismissal

These sessions were flexible enough to place emphasis on problems which arose during the preceding quarter. The basic time frame and general topics were maintained. The effectiveness of these training sessions was measured by on-the-job observation by the instructor and the principal of the junior high school during the quarter.

Provision for the Tutee

Basically, the students at Bacon County Junior High School were scheduled into physical education classes for forty-five minute periods. There were three such classes in the total school schedule. Primarily each grade (6, 7, 8) was placed in the physical education class by grade groups. One period was set aside for the sixth grade (N=170), one for the seventh grade (N=165), and one for the eighth grade (N=171). Male and female students attended the physical education classes together. Male and female tutors were also provided.

The format for the class was basically the same each day.

The first five minutes was set aside for "dressing out" and going to the assigned area to meet with the tutors. Ten minutes were then provided for "warming-up" calisthenics. Twenty-five minutes were devoted to instruction or participation in the activities. Five minutes for "dressing in" ended the period.

Each tutor was assigned a group of nine to fifteen tutees for "warm up" time. Size, sex, physical development, and health of the tutee were determinates of placement in a given group. In this way, even the calisthenics were individualized. The instructor and the tutors determined the placement of the tutees in the "warm up" group.

On the first school day of the week, the "warm up" period was not held. This time was used to develop the daily and weekly lesson plans. A list of the activities developed by the instructor and the tutors were provided. The tutees signed up for the activities of interest to them.

The criteria for participation in these activities were interest only. No one was denied participation on grounds

of ability, sex, or size. Some activities, such as football, were allowed for each sex separately, but were still provided. If it was thought that the activity was physically harmful to the tutee, advice and encouragement were given to choose other more appropriate activities. A student was required to participate in at least five different activities each school month. All activities were required during the school year unless medically prohibited.

During inclement weather, students were assigned activities in the gymnasium. A variety of games and drills were planned for such days.

On the first day of the school week, each tutor served as instructor for the activity assigned to him. If he were assigned volleyball, for instance, this time was used to teach rules and drills to those attending these activities. If a student felt competent in the activity, he could sign up for the activity and attend the participation sessions without instruction. This allowed participation in various activities each week even though instruction was given only once each week.

The second and subsequent days of the school week were used

for participating in the activities chosen, The activities as developed were:

1. Touch football
2. Baseball
3. Softball
4. Volleyball
5. Soccer
6. Tennis
7. Golf (driving and putting)
8. Track and field events
9. Dodge Ball
10. Handball
11. The Three R's*

The seasonal aspects of these activities were not considered. Basically, each activity was allowed throughout the year, weather permitting. During the Three R's period, jackstones, marbles, and even chess was allowable. The students determined what events were allowed. Only one Three R period was permitted in a ten school day period.

The component skills of some activities were also provided. Some sessions were devoted solely to field goal kicking,

*This was a supervised free play time. It was humoriously named the Three R's to mean "running, wrestling and recess."

free throw shooting, or soft ball batting practice. This allowed many more basic activities than the eleven listed.

During these periods of time if any misconduct occurred, the tutor immediately sent for the instructor. The instructor constantly circulated among the groups, giving assistance in instruction or discipline as needed. However, the tutor was not to wait for the instructor to come by but was to send for him by a student who was dependable.

The instructor determined the extent of action to be taken. According to the seriousness of the behavior and the severity of required action, the principal was consulted. When action more drastic than a normal conference was needed, the school procedures of written reporting of disciplinary problems to the school administration was followed using the appropriate forms. The signatures of both the instructor and tutor were required.

There were some students who were incapable of receiving instruction in physical education for either medical or religious reasons.[4] A procedure was developed whereby a

[4]Certain religious sects refuse to allow the wearing of shorts or long pants by females. The religious convictions were respected.

a student who claimed such disability was given sufficient time to produce a statement from a medical doctor in order to be re-scheduled in other classes. In cases of religious convictions, the written statement of parents was accepted. These statements were kept in the office of the principal.

If restrictions in physical education was medically recommended, the guidance described by the child's doctor described above was employed. In these instances, medical directions were required of the child's doctor. This information was discussed with the tutor and kept on file on the instructor's office.

Administrative Details

Certain administrative duties were essential throughout the implementation of this project. They were primarily monitoring and making changes in the program as needed. These aspects are discussed in their proper places elsewhere in this chapter. Also evaluation procedures are explained in a later chapter of this practicum report.

The major administrative detail not otherwise covered was that of developing the Administrator's Packet. The purpose of this packet was to disseminate and institutionalize the program. However, the packet was also invaluable in

program evaluation and "keeping on the target" as the implementation proceeded. Included in the packet were 1) the student manual, 2) the agenda and suggestions for training sessions, 3) equipment adjustments needed for the program, 4) problems and suggested solutions of problems that might occur, 5) cost comparisons of the peer tutoring model and the traditional model used before tutoring began, and 6) evaluation of the program.

In summary, the Administrator's Packet included all of the pertinent information contained in this report including tutor-tutee considerations as well as evaluation information needed to develop other similar projects. This packet as well as the Student Manual may be secured in the manner previously stated.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RESULTS

The program of work described in this report had five basic objectives. The purpose of this chapter is to report the evaluation data in order to demonstrate the success of the project. Each of the five objectives is evaluated separately and the results are included in the presentation. The evaluation of the overall program is also explained.

Measurement and Evaluation

The first objective of this project was to develop, implement, and evaluate a physical fitness program for junior high school students utilizing peer tutors under the direction of a certified physical education instructor. Provisions were made in the schedule of classes for the junior high school to insure that each student had an opportunity to participate in physical education. The schedule provided for three forty-five periods between 12:45 and 3:00 P.M. daily. Each class was programmed for the instruction of 170+

students. The pupils moved through the schedule by homeroom groups. School and individual schedules reflected the fact that the program actually implemented.[1]

The implementation of this project was further documented by the Evaluation Checklist.[2] Items three through ten of the Principal's Section of the Evaluation Checklist confirmed the existance of the physical fitness program. In addition, this instrument verified the certification of the insrtuctor.

According to the evaluation data, a physical fitness program utilizing peer tutors was implemented by 30 June 1977 at Bacon County Junior High School in Alma, Georgia. Therefore, the first objective was met successfully.

The second objective was to insure that all students physically-able (not medically excused) were, in fact, placed in a physical fitness program. Class rolls and the school schedule were designed to support this

[1]Sample individual and school schedules of the 1976-77 school year are appended in appendix B.

[2]The Evaluation Checklist is appended in appendix B.

objective. Three class rolls were used. The sixth period physical fitness class had 170 on roll. Of that number, seven had received medical excuses and none had religious exemptions. The seventh period physical fitness class had 165 on roll. Medical excuses were submitted by four students and one student was excused for religious reasons. The eighth period class had 171 students on roll. Three were medically excused and one was excused for religious reasons. In addition, there were approximately 265 "short-term" medical excuses ranging from one to five days due to a variety of medical causes including a flu epidemic. Students excused from physical fitness classes for medical and/or religious reasons were re-scheduled into art, chorus, or work-study.

As a result of this project, 96.8 per cent of the students enrolled at Bacon County Junior High School participated in the physical fitness program. A very small percentage (0.4%) were excused for religious reasons. Since these reasons were considered valid by Georgia School Law, this objective was successfully achieved.

The third objective dealt with the peer tutor. The

desired outcome was to enable the peer tutor to follow directions and instruct students in physical fitness skills by the end of each school quarter with 80 per cent accuracy as measured by the grades given by the physical education instructor. The Evaluation Checklist, which was used the physical education instructor, was the basis for determining assigned grades. A letter grade was awarded based on a percentage factor: 95%$^{+}$= A, 85%$^{+}$= B, 75%$^{+}$= C, 65%$^{+}$= D, and 64%$^{-}$= F. Table 1, on the following page, represents an individual student rating and the subsequent grade received.

Forty-five peer tutors were assigned from the high school to the junior high school to serve in this capacity. They were divided into three groups of fifteen. One group served as tutors during the fall quarter, one group served as peer tutors during the winter quarter, and another group was assigned this work during the spring quarter.

During the fall quarter none of the tutors had to be returned to the high school because of unsuccessful adjustment. One student had to be reassigned to the equipment care and maintenance because of his inability to control his temper.

Table 2 Individual Rating

Item	Poor 1	2	3	4	Good 5
Ability to follow directions					X
Ability to instruct				X	
Initiative				X	
Ability to establish rapport					X
Ability to serve as model				X	
Cooperativeness					X
Ability to recognize individual differences					X
Ability to handle conflict situations			X		
Ability to follow lesson plans				X	
Ability to select activities					X
Ability to handle small groups				X	
Ability to work with one to one					X
Ability to work with large groups			X		

Weighted scores:

1 X 0 = 0
2 X 0 = 0
3 X 2 = 6
4 X 5 = 20
5 X 6 = 30
TOTAL 56 ÷ 65 = 86 %

GRADE: B

50 a

During the winter and spring quarters, one student was returned during each sixty day period for "bullying" the students and bring alcohol on campus. The procedure outlined earlier was used for grading.

During this time, one student from the winter class and one student from the spring class were reassigned to duties other than instruction. The reasons were failure to make the changes needed and a medical problem that prohibited the tutor's participation.

A total of two students were returned to the high school and three students were reassigned on the junior high school campus. Grades for the peer tutors who were reassigned were based on cooperation, completion of tasks, and willingness to perform tasks assigned. Their grades were not used in compiling the overall effectiveness rating.

The overall effectiveness of the program on the peer tutor was based on the scores of forty peer tutors. The results of the evaluation were determined by using the total student rating in much the same manner as grade assignments for individual students were made. These data are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Student Ratings

Items	Poor 1	2	3	4	Good 5
Ability to follow directions			3	9	28
Ability to instruct			2	8	30
Initiative		1	4	7	28
Ability to establish rapport			1	2	37
Ability to serve as models			1	4	35
Cooperativeness				2	38
Ability to recognize individual difference			3	15	22
Ability to handle conflict situatuions		1	4	5	30
Ability to follow lesson plans				3	37
Ability to select activities				1	39
Ability to handle small groups				4	36
Ability to work with one to one				1	39
Ability to work with large groups			4	5	31

This Table shows the number of students that achieved each rating for each item. N=40.

Weighted score 2484 ÷ possible perfect score 2600 = 95.5%

The effectiveness rating of Objective 3 based on the data gathered was 95.5 per cent. This measure more than equaled the criterion of 80 per cent that was established. Individual analysis of student grades revealed that 65 per cent (N=26) made an A, 25 per cent (N=10) made a B, and 10 per cent (N=4) made a C during the school year. Therefore, for the peer tutor the project seemed to be a success.

The fourth objective was to design, implement, and evaluate a model program for physical education that would be more cost effective than the traditional model. Table 3 was designed to illustrate the cost comparison figures. The traditional model used in 1975-76 required $12,033.00 of state monies and $3,491.00 of local funds to implement. The peer tutoring model required $6,016.50 in state funds and $3,276.00 in local monies. Although the amount of local expenditures did not differ significantly, the amount of state monies used for this purpose was significantly less for the peer tutoring model. If the local Board of Education had elected to follow the traditional model, they would have been required to supplement the effort with an additional $6,016.50.

Table 3 Bacon County Junior High

Cost Comparison for Physical Education

State Funds

	1975-76	1976-77	Difference
Salary of Instructor	$10,708.00	$5,354.00	- $5,354.00
Maintenance and Operation	1,250.00	625.00	- 625.00
Sick Leave	75.00	37.50	- 37.50
TOTAL	$12,033.00	$6,016.50	- $6,016.50

Local Funds

	1975-76	1976-77	Difference
Utilities for Gym			
Electricity	$ 900.00	$ 675.00	- $ 225.00
Heat	1,215.00	900.00	- 585.00
Equipment			
Softball	150.00	200.00	+ 50.00
Basketball	96.00	150.00	+ 54.00
Football	75.00	95.00	+ 20.00
Tennis	60.00	75.00	+ 15.00
Volleyball	70.00	70.00	-0-
Golf	25.00	40.00	+ 15.00
Track	-0-	-0-	-0-
Handball	-0-	30.00	+ 30.00
Miscellaneous	100.00	250.00	+ 150.00
Salary supplement for coach	800.00	800.00	-0-
TOTAL	$3,491.00	$3,276.00	- $ 224.00

The fifth objective established guidelines to insure that the peer tutor program under the supervision of a certified physical education instructor was equal to or superior to the physical education program that was directed in the traditional manner by a full time instructor. The quality of the program was to be evaulated by the evaluation checklist. Items considered included the amount of time spent in small and large group activities, the amount of instruction, pupil-teacher ratio, the amount of spectator time, the types of activities and variation of activities.

The checklist was given to 330 students from the seventh and eighth grade, who had participated in the physical education program during the 1975-76 school year and were also in the program during the 1976-77 school year. The students were asked to answer yes or no to a series of exercises and activities that were offered during each year. The responses were to signify whether the students participated in the activities.

The twenty-two items listed represented the major components of the physical education program and the peer

tutor physical fitness program. According to the results of the evaluation, 98 per cent of the students participated in each activity both years. There were no value judgements asked. The purpose of the checklist was to determine whether the peer tutor program was equal to or surpassed the quality of the physical fitness program when a full time instructor was available. Since the same activities and exercises were taught both years, the curriculum was the same.

The principal's section of the checklist also compared the physical education program for the two school years being considered. Items one through eleven indicated that the program was equal in quality, with two exceptions. The cost comparison of the programs, as stated above, show advantages for the peer tutoring model. Also, item number ten showed a teacher pupil ratio of one teacher for ninety students in 1975-76, while the peer tutor pupil teacher ratio for 1976-77 averaged one tutor for eleven students.

Based on comparisons for the two school years by student and principal responses, the program was evaluated. As a

result of these evaluations, the peer tutoring program of physical education at Bacon County Junior High School was found to be as good as or better than the traditional physical education program previously offered.

The evaluation of the project was conducted through the use of an Evaluation Process Scale designed to assist in practicum evaluations.[3] Each step in the procedures developed to carry out the program was listed and rated on a scale of one to five. An effectiveness rating of 80 per cent was established for successful implementation. The actual resulting score was 93 per cent. Therefore, in general, the criterion was met.

The major problem of the project was the ability of the participant to establish adequate time frames and to establish and keep monitoring schedules. Without careful pacing, the participant tended to allow other pressing administrative duties to interfere with the observation periods.

[3]The Evaluation Process Scale (Armstrong, 1976) ia attached in appendix B.

Institutionalization

At the completion of the school year (1976-77), adjustments that were needed as a result of the evaluation were studied in order to determine if the model should 1) be continued at the present level, 2) be modified in order to improve the model, or 3) be replaced with a different plan. It was decided to present the project to the local Board of Education as a viable alternative to the traditional program. This was accomplished by a presentation to the August 1977 regular board meeting.

Dissemination

Dissemination of this model was conducted by discussing the Administrator's Packet and the Student Manual with the principal of the Bacon County Elementary School and three other principals of junior high and elementary school in adjoining counties for consideration. A total packet was placed in the media center of the Okefenokee Cooperative Educational Services Agency for use in staff development activites in the area school systems. All dissemination activities were on a voluntary basis. Three principals visited the project. Two superintendents also inquired about the physical fitness program. Plans

for further dissemination were also made. Continued visitation and consultation will be provided upon request.

Resources

The cost of the project was minimal. The instructor was provided through state allotment. After the initial investment in equipment, the costs for maintenance and replacement would be no more than the traditional program.

The development and implementation of the program did not require any additional labor demands of the system. It did require approxiamtely 300 person hours on the part of the participant during a nine months period. No special materials or facilities were necessary.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

This project was designed to develop and implement a model for providing a physical education program for the students at Bacon County Junior High School utilizing the resources available. The concept was based on the results of effective programs employing peer tutors as instructors. A corollary goal was to provide positive experiences for both the tutors and the tutees.

Another objective of the project was to provide a program that was equal to or superior to the traditional physical education program taught by a trained teacher on a full time basis. Limiting expenditures to available funds was essential. Meeting state standards and accrediting criteria was mandatory.

The program design was built to meet identified needs within the system. After research to develop a strategy, which included a review of the literature and an investigation of innovative programs of physical education,

a peer tutoring model was develop, implemented, and evaluated. Plans for institutionalization into the system were made and approved. Dissemination of activities to other possible consumers in the area was conducted.

As a result of this project it was demonstrated that in times when allocations are limited, quality programs can be developed and implemented using resources that are already available in the system. With careful planning, problems can be solved without damaging program effectiveness.

APPENDIX A

Bacon County Junior High School
East Sixteenth Street
ALMA, GEORGIA 31510
Office 632-4662 – Gym 632-5414

October 10, 1976

EDISON MURPHY
SUPERINTENDENT
WENDELL R. TANNER
PRINCIPAL
GAIL MARTIN
SECRETARY

Mr. Edison Murphy
Superintendent,
Bacon County Schools
Alma, Georgia, 31510

Dear Mr. Murphy;

After reviewing the present status of the physical education program at Bacon County Junior High School with you, I feel that it would be appropriate to recommend the peer-tutoring program. It is true that this program will require complete cooperation from the administration and personnel of the High School and the County Office. For this reason, I am requesting letters of commitment from each of the individuals involved in this project.

Your prompt attention to this most important matter will be greatly appreciated. If there are any questions that you have relative to this project, I will be most happy to meet with you in order that full understanding be reached.

Sincerely yours,

Wendell R Tanner

WRT/gm

EDISON D. MURPHY
School Superintendent

JACK C. CARTER
Chairman

GLENDA G. JOHNSON
Vice-Chairman

BACON COUNTY
Board of Education
NORTH PIERCE STREET
ALMA, GEORGIA 31510
PHONE (912) 632-7969

ALEX B. GREENWAY
Member

ALLEN T. JOHNSON
Member

JAMES L. McQUAIG, O.D.
Member

October 16, 1976

Mr. Wendell Tanner, Principal
Bacon County Junior High School
Alma, Georgia 31510

Dear Mr. Tanner:

For some time now, the Bacon County School System has been thinking about using high school students to help the physical education teacher in the junior high school.

Since you are coming to the system this year as a new principal of the Junior High School, we would be very glad for you to try this approach to providing physical education for the Junior High School.

I feel that since you are using this project as part of your Nova program, you will be very conscientious about the performance of the high school students.

I have confidence that you will take the time to see that this program is supervised properly.

Thanking you in advance for your interest, I am

Very truly yours,

Edison D. Murphy

Edison D. Murphy, Superintendent

EDM/ve

EDISON D. MURPHY
School Superintendent

JACK C. CARTER
Chairman

GLENDA G. JOHNSON
Vice Chairman

BACON COUNTY
Board of Education
NORTH PIERCE STREET
ALMA, GEORGIA 31510
PHONE (912) 632-7565

ALEX B. GREENWAY
Member

ALLEN T. JOHNSON
Member

JAMES L. McQUAIG, O.D.
Member

May 17, 1977

Mr. Wendell Tanner
Principal
Bacon County Junior High School
16th Street
Alma, Georgia 31510

Dear Mr. Tanner:

I continue to support your work with the peer tutoring concept in Physical Education. If you feel that adjustments are necessary, please notify me. If you feel that this program should be adopted for your school next year, I will be glad to present the proposal to the Board of Education for adoption.

Thank you for your work in this area. If I can be of service, let me know.

Sincerely,

Edison D. Murphy

Edison D. Murphy
Superintendent

EDM/ve

EDISON D. MURPHY
School Superintendent

JACK C. CARTER
Chairman

GLENDA G. JOHNSON
Vice-Chairman

BACON COUNTY
Board of Education
NORTH PIERCE STREET
ALMA, GEORGIA 31510
PHONE (912) 632-7363

ALEX B. GREENWAY
Member

ALLEN T. JOHNSON
Member

JAMES L. McQUAIG, O.D.
Member

October 17, 1976

Mr. Wendell Tanner, Principal
Bacon County Junior High School
Alma, Georgia 31510

Dear Mr. Tanner:

This letter is in reference to the project that you are undertaking at your school in the area of Physical Education. I understand the concept of the use of high school students to assist in working with junior high school students in physical education. I want you to know that I will cooperate with you in this project and will lend to this effort my full support.

Yours truly,

James E. Deen, Director
Curriculum and Federal Projects

JED/ve

Bacon County High School

Telephone (912) 632-4414

ALMA, GEORGIA 31510

October 18, 1976

HUBERT W. SASSER
Principal

Mr. Wendell Tanner, Principal
Bacon County Junior High School
Alma, Georgia 31510

Dear Mr. Tanner:

The school counselor, Mrs. Lillian McCrea, and I have discussed the peer tutoring program for Physical Education at the junior high and are in agreement with its purposes. Be assured that we will cooperate in every way possible to aid you in this effort.

Very truly yours,

H W Sasser

Mr. H. W. Sasser
Principal

HWS/ve

Bacon County High School

Telephone (912) 632-4414
ALMA, GEORGIA 31510

October 19, 1976

HUBERT W. SASSER
Principal

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Mrs. Woodrow McCrea

TO: Mr. Wendell Tanner

As Counselor of Bacon County High School, I am in full agreement with the concept of allowing high school students to work with your Junior High in a peer tutoring relationship for physical education.

I feel that a program of this type will not only aid your program and students, but will also be of great benifit to the tutors as well.

I pledge my full support and cooperation in this endeaver.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 19, 1976

FROM: James Vickers, Coach

To: Mr. Wendell Tanner, Principal

I am excited about the prospects of working with you this year in your physical education program. You may be assured that I will do everything that I can to make this program a success. As soon as you can meet with me to begin to pull student records and screen the applicants, I am ready.

Thank you for your confidence in me. I trust that we will have a good year.

APPENDIX B

Bacon County Junior High School
STUDENT SCHEDULE
1976-77

NAME: _____ GRADE: 8th HOMEROOM: 8-D

8:00 to 8:15	Homeroom
8;15 to 9:00	Math
9:05 to 9:50	Health
9:50 to 10:05	Recess
10:05 to 10:50	Fine Arts
10:55 to 11:40	Science
11:45 to 12:30	Social Studies
12:35 to 1:20	Lunch
1:25 to 2:10	English
2:15 to 3:00	Physical Education
3:00 to 3:15	Homeroom

	HR 8:00 8:15	1 8:15 9;00	2 9:05 9:50	recess 9:50 10:05	3 10:05 10:50	4 10:55 11.40	5 11:45 12:30	6 12:35 1:20	7 1:25 2:10	1 2:15 3:00	HR 3:00 3:15
BENNETT	8A	scienceA	sci. B		sci. c	sci. D	SCI. F	LUNCH F	PLAN F	SCI.E	8A
TAYLOR	8B	MUSIC B	MUSIC C		MUSIC D	MUSIC E	LUNCH E	PLAN E	MUSIC A	MUSIC F	8B
COBB	8C	HEALTH C	H. D		H. E	H. F	H. A	LUNCH A	H. B	PLAN B	8C
DOUGLAS	8D	MATH D	MATH E		MATH F	MATH A	MATH B	LUNCH B	MATH C	PLAN C	8D
LEWIS	8E	ENG. E	ENG. F		ENG. A	ENG. B	ENG. C	LUNCH C	ENG. D	PLAN D	8E
MARNOCK	8F	S.S. F	S.S. A		S.S. B	S.S. C	S.S. D	LUNCH D	S.S. E	PLAN A	8F
ARMSTRONG	7D	ART D	ART C		ART F	ART E	LUNCH E	PLAN E	ART B	ART A	7D
FULTON	7A	S.S. A	S.S. B		S.S. C	S.S. D	LUNCH D	PLAN D	S.S. F	S.S.E	7A
HALL	7E	SCI. E/F	SC. E/F		SC. B/A	SC. B/A	LUNCH B	PLAN B	SC. C/D	SC. C/D	7E
HARVEY	7C	MATH C	MATH D		MATH E	MATH F	LUNCH F	PLAN F	MATH A	MATH B	7C
MONTGOMERY	7B	ENG. B	ENG. A		ENG. D			PLAN C	ENG.E	ENG. F	7B
SOLOMON	7F	PECE F/E	PECE f/e		PECE A/b	PECE AB	LUNCH A	PLAN A	PECE D/C	PECE D/C	7F
BENNETT						ENG. C	LUNCH C				
BOATRIGHT	6D	MATH D	MATH D		MATH F	LUNCH F	MATH F	MATH E	PLAN E	MATH E	6D
HARRISON	6A	MATH A	MATH A		MATH C	LUNCH C	MATH C	MATH B	PLAN B	MATH B	6A
JOHNSON	6C	S.S. C	S.S. F		S.S. B	LUNCH E	S.S. E	S.S. A	PLAN A	S.S. D	6C
MOSBY	6E	L.A. E	L.A. E		L.A. D	LUNCH D	L.A. D	L.A. F	PLAN F	L.A. F	6E
ROGERS	6F	READ F	READ C		READ E	READ B	LUNCH B	PLAN D	READ D	READ A	6F
TAYLOR	6B	L.A. B	LA B		L.A. A	LUNCH A	L.A. A	L.A. C	PLAN C	L.A. C	6B
VICKERS 76								7th	6th	8th	
WATERS											

PRACTICUMS LABORATORY
Introductory Proposal
Addendum
Wendell R. Tanner

EVALUATION CHECK LIST

In order to compare the peer-tutor physical fitness program (1976-77) with the traditional physical education program (1975-76), the following information is needed. Please complete those sections which apply to you. This data will be consolidated in a formal report to the Bacon County Board of Education.

I. PRINCIPAL	1975-76 Yes	1975-76 No	1976-77 Yes	1976-77 No
1. Does the physical education program meet State Standards?	x		x	
2. Does the physical education program meet the standards of the Georgia Accrediting Commission?	x		x	
3. Is the physical education program under the supervision of a certified physical education instructor?	x		x	
4. Are a variety of activities offered?				
a. Small group activities	x		x	
b. Large group activities	x		x	
c. Self-competitive activities	x		x	
d. Other-competitive activities	x		x	
5. Does the schedule allow each student to enroll?	x		x	
6. Does the program permit medical exemptions?	x		x	
7. Are provisions made that each student may participate on a daily basis?	x		x	
8. Are activities geared to individual differences?	x		x	

		1975-76	1976-77
9.	Length of time per class period	30 min	45 min
10.	Teacher/peer - pupil ratio	1-90	1-11
11.	Cost comparison		
	a. Salary of instructor	See Table 2, page 54	
	b. Materials		
	c. Maintenance and Operation of gymnasium		

II. STUDENTS	1975-76 Yes	1975-76 No	1976-77 Yes	1976-77 No
1. Do you have the opportunity to participate in the following exercises?				
a. Push-ups	330	0	330	0
b. Sit-ups	314	16	325	5
c. Knee bends	318	12	327	3
d. Duck walk	311	19	320	10
e. Jumping-jack	320	10	315	15
f. Running	330	0	330	0
g. Walking	330	0	330	0
h. Touch toes	325	5	323	7
i. Side bends	324	6	326	4
j. Back bends	317	13	324	6
2. Do you particpate in the following group activities?				
a. Basketball	326	4	326	4
b. Football	278	52*	320	10
c. Softball	327	3	328	2
d. Volleyball	327	3	327	3
e. Dodgeball	330	0	330	0
f. Soccer	318	12	330	0
g. Kickball	327	3	317	13
h. Relay races	330	0	330	0
i. 100 yard dash	321	9	320	10
j. 50 yard dash	330	0	324	6
k. Broad jump	330	0	330	0
l. Tennis	309	21	326	4

*Mostly girls

EVALUATION CHECK LIST

PART II: Peer-Tutor Effectiveness

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the peer-tutor program, the following information is needed.

I. PRINCIPAL

1. How many peer-tutors have been utilized in the physical fitness program this year?

   45

2. How were the peer-tutors selected?

   See text, pages 32-33

3. What was the composition of the group?

   Sex: 25 males, 20 females

   Race: 35 whites, 10 blacks (Total school population is 83% white, 17% black)

   Age: 16-18

   Grade: 11th and 12th graders

4. How were assignments made?

   See text, page 41

5. What was the peer-tutor ratio?

   1 to 11

6. How were the peer-tutors trained?

   See text, pages 34-35

7. When and for what reasons were re-assignments made?

See text, pages 37-38; pages 50-51

8. How often was re-assignment necessary?

See text, pages 50-51

9. What were the positive factors of this program as far as the peer-tutors are concerned?

Opportunity for teaching - learning by doing

Promotes initiative

Ability to follow directions

10. What are the negative factors of this program as far as the peer-tutors are concerned?

Could only serve one quarter

Tendency to become frustrated because they could not handle discipline problems

II. PHYSICAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTOR

1. How were peer-tutors selected?

See text, pages 32-33

2. What seems to be the most important factors as related to the success of peer-tutors?

Training

Supervision

3. Please rate the change in the peer-tutors on the following characteristics:

See text, page 51-53	Poor 1	2	3	4	Good 5
Ability of follow directions	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to instruct	1	2	3	4	5
Initiative	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to establish rapport	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to serve as models	1	2	3	4	5
Cooperativeness	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to recognize individual differences	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to handle conflict situations	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to follow lesson plans	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to select activities for daily activities	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to handle small groups	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to work with one-to-one	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to work with large groups	1	2	3	4	5

4. What were the most positive aspects of the program?

lower pupil teacher ratio

more opportunity for individualization

more opportunity for instruction in fundamentals

5. What were the negative aspects of the program?

new tutors to train each quarter

6. Do you believe that this program should be continued? If yes, what changes need to be made? If no, why?

Yes, the program should be continued. Peer-tutors should be assigned for the entire year whenever possible. A track should be laid out and better driving range for golf provided.

III. PEER-TUTORS

1. What do you believe that you learned as a peer-tutor?

how to work with people

how to follow directions

more about the rules of various games

what a teacher does

2. What were the most difficult problems as a peer-tutor?

making the students mind

being responsible for others

3. What were your main responsibilities?

selecting activities

working with large and small groups

helping to determine grades

4. What did you learn about helping others as a peer-tutor?

you have to be patient

people are undependable - you don't know how they will react

some people appreciate your help

5. Why did you volunteer to be a peer-tutor?

to learn to help others do something I like to do

to learn to teach

6. Would you volunteer for this program again? Why or Why not?

yes (39 students) - I like working with others

no (6) - it is too hard

7. Do you think other students would benefit from this type of experience?

yes (all)

8. What changes could make this program better?

more time to serve as a tutor (more quarters)

9. Has this program helped you as to a career decision? If so, in what way?

41 stated that it had provided experience with helping others

38 stated that it had shown them what teaching would be like

14 stated that they wanted to be teachers

27 said they wanted to do something to help others (14 above not included)

10. Should this program be continued? Why or why not?

42 stated yes. It provides students an opportunity to work with others, to learn to teach, and to learn more about physical fitness.

EVALUATION SHEET - PRACTICUM PROCESS

PRACTICUMS LABORATORY
Introducotry Proposal
Wendell R. Tanner
Page 1

PROCEDURES	Target Date	Date Accomplished	Effectiveness Adequate -- Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5	Comments
#1. Approval of Superintendent	8/30/76	8/15/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
and Curriculum Director	8/30/76	8/15/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#2. Agreement from H.S. principal	8/30/76	8/20/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#3. Agreement from Instructor	8/30/76	8/25/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#4. Approval of Superintendent	8/30/76	8/30/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#5. Review literature	3/10/77	4/1/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#6 Contact Consultants	4/22/77	4/22/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#7. Schedule Classes			1 2 3 4 5	
1. Fall Quarter	8/31/76	8/31/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
2. Winter Quarter	11/26/76	11/26/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
3. Spring Quarter	3/4/77	3/8/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#8. Administrators Packet	4/6/77	4/15/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#9. Student Manual	5/20/77	5/20/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#10. Select Instructors			1 2 3 4 5	
1. Fall Quarter	8/30/76	8/30/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
2. Winter Quarter	11/25/76	11/25/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
3. Spring Quarter	3/7/77	3/7/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	

EVALUATION SHEET - PRACTICUM PROCESS

PRACTICUMS LABORATORY
Introducotry Proposal
-Wendell R. Tanner
Page 2

PROCEDURES	Target Date	Date Accomplished	Effectiveness Adequate -- Inadequate 1 2 3 4 5	Comments
#11. Alternative Assignments			1 2 3 4 5	
1. Fall Quarter	9/10/76	9/13/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
2. Winter Quarter	12/4/76	12/9/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	unqualified tutors were reassi
3 Spring Quarter	3/18/77	3/18/77	1 (2) 3 4 5	unqualified tutors were reassi
#12. training for Peer-tutors			1 2 3 4 5	
1. Fall Quarter	9/31/76	8/31/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
2. Winter Quarter	12/1/76	12/1/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
3. Spring Quarter	3/4/77	3/5/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#13. Monitor lesson Plans	5/27/77	5/27/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#14. Grading Procedures	9/10/76	9/8/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#15. Assigning Students to tutors	9/1/76	9/2/76	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#16. Discipline procedures	9/1/76	9/1/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	
#17. medical exemptions	9/10/76	9/7/76	1 (2) 3 4 5	Some changes need to be mad
#18. Monitor program	5/27/77	5/27/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#19. Dissemination	6/15/77	6/20/77	(1) 2 3 4 5	
#20. Write Report	6/29/77	9/15/77	1 (2) 3 4 5	
			1 2 3 4 5	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administrator's Memo: Youth Tutoring Youth (New York: National Commission on Resources for Youth Inc., 1968).

Albizer-Melendez, Winifred, A Comparative Analysis of Three Instructional Approaches to the Teaching of Reading (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Serivces ED 126 476, 1976).

Bloom, Sophie, Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring in the Schools: An Individualized Supplement in Group Instruction (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 118 543, 1976).

Brod, Pearl, Effects of Tutoring on the Tutee in an Upward Bound Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 442, 1970).

Buddy-Tutor Project (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 208, 1976).

Collins, Joseph F. and Calevro, Michael J., Mainstreaming Special Education Using a Peer Tutoring System and a Minimum Objective Curriculum for Eighth Graders (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 102 788, 1974).

A Curriculum Guide for School and Community Services (Spring Valley, New York: Ramapo Central School District Number 2, 1973).

Deering, Albert, Welcome to Tutoring Grades 3, 4, 5, 6 (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 029 841, 1972).

DeLargy, Paul, A Physical Education Teaching Guide (Hinesville, Georgia: Liberty County Board of Education, 1971).

Deterline, William A., Training and Management of Student-Tutors (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 048 133, 1970).

Dial, Donald and Salanas, Terry, Ware County Board of Education, Waycross, Georgia, Interview 15 November 1976.

Diamond, Barbara, Effects of Cross-Age Tutoring on Self-Esteem and Reading Achievement (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 481, 1976).

Dillner, Martha, 'Tutoring by Students: Who Benefits?" Research Bulletin vol 7 (Spring/Summer 1971): 1-35.

Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor, The Role Change Intervention: An Experiment in Cross-Age Tutoring (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 949, 1970).

_____, "The Role Change Intervention: Experimental Data and Design for Compensatory Education," Central State Psychology Bulletin (March 1976): 14-27.

Fisherman, Florence, and Dugan, Marjorie, Alternative Programs and Services for the Non-Traditional Student (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 380, 1977).

Georgia Accrediting Commission Bulletin (Springfield, Georgia: Georgia Accrediting Commission, 1976).

Georgia State Standards (Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Department of Education, 1976).

Goheen, Royal L., The Development and Evaluation of Three Types of Physical Education Programs for Educable Mentally Retarded Boys (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 012 141, 1967).

Halls, William Alford, A Study of the Effects of a Structured Tutorial Program Has on the Reading Levels in the Sixth Grade (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 483, 1976).

Harrison, Grant V. The Effects of Trained and Untrained Student Tutors on the Criterion Performance of Disadvantaged First Graders (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 031 449, 1969).

Harrison, Grant Von, Structured Tutoring (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 053 080, 1971).

Harrison, Grant Von and Cohen, Arthur M., Teaching Students to Tutor (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 011 142, 1967).

Hedges, Larry V. and Majer, Kenneth, A Longitudinal Comparative Study of a Process-Oriented Tutorial Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 835, 1976).

The Honolulu Buddy System Project: Training, Evaluation and Research (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 206, 1973).

Jacobson, Paul B., Reavis, William C., and Logsdon, James D., The Effective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963).

Kilmer, Joycelyn, An Adventure in Enrichment (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 008 178, 1973).

The Learning Skills Center, Final Report: North Dakota State School of Science (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 126 317, 1974).

Mohan, Madan, Peer-Tutoring as a Technique for Teaching the Unmotivated (Fredonia, New York: Teacher Education Center, State University of New York, 1972).

Manual for Developing a Senior Citizen Teacher Aide Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 139, 1975).

Notes on the Use of Auxillary Personnel in Some Canadian School Systems (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 121 794, 1975).

Orost, Jean H., Effects of Age and Familiarity of Examiner on Test Performance: A Draft (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 069 689, 1972).

Patterson, R. T., Jr., Planning and Implementing a Peer-Tutoring Program to Individualize Instruction to Improve Reading Achievement (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 131 434, 1976).

Physical Education for Tomorrow (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 114 690, 1976).

Project HOPE Health and Optimum Phsycial Education (Ocilla, Georgia: Irwin County Schools, 1973).

Quilling, Mary R.,"Controlled Experimentation in Research and Instructional Units," American Educational Research Association (February 1968): 1-9.

Ramig, Linda and Ramig, Christopher, Cross-Age Tutoring: A Study of Achievement and Attitude at Grades Three and Five (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 124 928, 1976).

Raushenbush, John,"The Student as Teacher," The Independent School Bulletin vol 27 (December 1967): 35-6.

Roberts, Janet, Harrap's Handbook for Literacy Tutors (London:George G. Harrap and Company, Ltd., 1977).

Rosenbaum, Peter S., Peer-Mediated Instruction (New York: Teacher College Press, 1972).

Rosner, Herbert,"Facets of a Cross-Grade Tutorial Program," (Anaheim, California: International Reading Association Conference, 1970).

Shreve, Barbara, The OASIS Peer Tutoring Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 129 178, 1976).

Svicarovich, John, Manual for Developing a Volunteer Tutoring Program (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 131 575, 1974).

Thomas, John, Junior-Senior High Tutor-Aide Program at Malcolm X Elementary School (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 132 128, 1976).

Trimble, W. E., and Unterseher, The Influence of a Structured Phsycial Education Program on Adolescent Personality (Bethesda, MAryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 015 519, 1967).

Volunteers in Education (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: (Recruitment, Leadership and Training Institute, 1975).

Werth, Trostel Gifford, An Assessment of the Reciprocal Effect of High School Senior Low Achievers Tutoring Low Achieving Freshmen in English (Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 003 956, 1968).

Williams, Barbara Ivory "The Need to Study Multiple Skills," American Educational Research Association (April 1976): 1-30.

You're the Tutor (New York: National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc., 1968).